

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 194

24

RC 004 203

AUTHOR Donohew, Lewis; Parker, Joanne M.
TITLE Impacts of Educational Change Efforts in Appalachia.
INSTITUTION New Mexico State Univ., University Park. ERIC
 Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau
 of Research.
BUREAU NO BR-6-2469
PUB DATE Mar 70
CONTRACT OEC-1-6-062469-1574
NOTE 21p.
AVAILABLE FROM Duplicating Service, New Mexico State University, P.
 O. Box 3-CB, Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001 (\$1.00)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.15
DESCRIPTORS Adults, Agency Role, Behavior Change, *Change
 Agents, Changing Attitudes, Community Action,
 Cultural Factors, *Educational Development,
 Educational Improvement, *Intervention, Leadership,
 *Rural Areas, *Social Systems, Youth
IDENTIFIERS Appalachia

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this document was to gather information on the effects of recent developments and improvements in educational programs in Appalachia. The presentation is primarily intended for teachers, administrators, members of school boards of education, and others involved in educational projects in the Appalachian region. The paper focuses on all kinds of efforts put forth to educate people of Appalachia, not just efforts of formal educational systems. Organization of the paper follows a model of change in which the authors discuss the Appalachian setting and inputs for change which have been introduced and then attempt to assess the impact of various programs of the life-styles of individuals and on the institutional structures. Notes and a reference list are included. (AN)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

ED038194

IMPACTS OF EDUCATIONAL CHANGE EFFORTS IN APPALACHIA

by

Lewis Donohew

and

Joanne M. Parker

School of Communications
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
CLEARINGHOUSE ON RURAL EDUCATION AND SMALL SCHOOLS (CRESS)

New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001

March 1970

RC 004203

This publication was prepared pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Related ERIC/CRESS Publications

Change in Small Schools

by

Everett M. Rogers and Lynne Svenning

Paper presented at a National Working Conference on Solving Educational Problems in Sparsely Populated Areas, Denver, Colorado, March 17-19, 1969. Order only from EDRS as indicated below. (ED 029 749. Price: MF—\$0.25, HC—\$1.80.)

Rural Education and Small Schools, A Selected Bibliography

by

Stanley R. Wurster and James E. Heathman

A bibliography of selected documents which appear in the ERIC collection (through September 1969) relevant to rural education and small schools. Indexed. 316 annotated citations. Paperbound copies of this bibliography may be obtained from—Manager, Duplicating Services; New Mexico State University, P. O. Box 3-CB; Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001—at a cost of \$1.25 each for 1-5 copies or \$1.00 each for orders of over 5 copies. Microfiche or hardcopy reproductions must be ordered from EDRS as indicated below. (ED 033 257. Price: MF—\$0.75, HC—\$9.15.)

Copies of these documents in either microfiche (MF) or hardcopy (HC) must be ordered by individual ED numbers. Payment must accompany orders totaling less than \$5.00. For all orders, add \$0.50 for handling. In the U.S., add sales tax as applicable. Foreign orders must be accompanied by a 25 percent service charge, calculated to the nearest cent. Orders should be sent to:

**ERIC Document Reproduction Service
The National Cash Register Company
4936 Fairmont Avenue
Bethesda, Maryland 20014**

CONTENTS

Tasks of the Change Agent in an Underdeveloped Area	1
Purpose of this Paper	2
Appalachia as an Underdeveloped Area	2
Inputs for Change	5
Efforts at Changing Life-styles of Individuals	7
Efforts at Changing the Institutional Structure	8
Discussion	10
NOTES	12
BIBLIOGRAPHY	16

TASKS OF THE CHANGE AGENT IN AN UNDERDEVELOPED AREA

Problems faced by the change agent in Appalachia in many ways resemble those of the change agent in underdeveloped countries around the world. Each is faced with the task of motivating people to change their individual life-styles, and this often has been approached by attempting to provide them with clues to what the "better things of life" might be. Primarily, the change agent is concerned with modernization and, according to Everett M. Rogers, modernization is essentially a communication process.¹ One of the major spokesmen for this approach has been Daniel Lerner, who has said that "before any enduring transformation of the vicious circle of poverty can be started, people will have to learn about the life-ways evolved in other societies."² This approach counts heavily on fostering social change through inputs of new ideas directly to the "man on the street" or, in the Appalachian instance, the man who may live at the head of the hollow.

This task may be even more formidable if it also involves changing the prevailing institutional structures—including political and educational—in order to permit a motivated people to achieve some of the changes they seek. In the Appalachian case, this might be a serious problem, indeed, as indicated by Peter Schrag's picture of the operation of its educational-political structure:

The eminences of the county seats—small time politicians, all of them—have attained Olympian stature in the eyes of many of their oppressed mountain constituents. For years they have been taught to depend on the small blessings that trickle from these lesser village gods; jobs as bus drivers and lunchroom employees, leniency in misdemeanor cases, perhaps a little extra welfare assistance for a needy cousin. People who question or criticize lose favor with the powers, and even tenured school teachers, presumably protected by law, can be exiled to one-room schools in distant hollows. Thus much of the new money—and therefore the power—is not associated with the Federal government. It does not come from Washington, or even from the state capital, but from the county courthouse and from the office of the county school superintendent.³

Which should come first, changes in the people or changes in the structure? Those who support the communication thesis argue that the modernization process begins with the diffusion of new ideas and new information which stimulate the people to want to behave in new ways, generating a kind of "psychic mobility" and a drive which leads to increased participation in the society and eventual changes in the structure. For example, Harry K. Schwarzweller and James S. Brown, drawing upon data gathered from their own and other studies in Appalachia, have stated that the school system brings about changes in general orientations which set the stage for changes in specific orientations, both educational and non-educational. They conclude that "with time and under certain conditions" these changes in orientation result in changes in the institutional structure of the region.⁴ The other side of the argument is illustrated by

the statement recently offered by James E. Grunig⁵ that such communication inputs are merely complementary factors to modernization and development and that they can have little effect unless structural changes come first to initiate the development process.

The dilemma posed in the arguments presented above is illustrated in the article by Schrag. He reports that the average mountaineer is fully committed to the idea of education for his children—a statement which has some empirical support⁶—but that most of the individuals and agencies seeking change have left the prevailing educational-political structures untouched:

. . . essentially they have conducted rescue operations, teaching skills and organizing small community development or rehabilitation projects while leaving the system unchanged.⁷

PURPOSE OF THIS PAPER

In this paper, we focus on the impact of education in Appalachia, broadly defined to include not just effects of formal educational systems, but also those of other efforts—particularly those by government—to change both the attitudes and behaviors of the people and the structure of the systems in which they exist. The process of change through the diffusion of new ideas and practices has already been well-described by Rogers, both for underdeveloped societies generally and for rural schools in particular, the latter in a monograph for the present series.⁸ Our paper is organized along the lines indicated by this model of change.

In the following pages, we shall (1) discuss the Appalachian setting and inputs for change which have been introduced; then (2) attempt to assess the impact of various programs on the life-styles of individuals, and (3) on the institutional structures.

APPALACHIA AS AN UNDERDEVELOPED AREA

Appalachia is both a geographic region and particular subculture of the United States which, in turn, has been structured in great part by the physical characteristics of the area. A number of delineations of the geographic area have been formed over the years. In one of these, the boundaries of the region fluctuate about a range of old mountains whose highest peak is about 6,700 feet above sea level. The range is inland from the Atlantic coast and stretches 1,300 miles from Vermont to northern Alabama. The delineation used in this paper was developed from the *Appalachian Region Data Book* (1964) and includes counties in Alabama, Georgia, Maryland, Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. From this larger region, the Council of the Southern Mountains has developed a boundary including 278 counties, which excludes all of those counties in Pennsylvania and Ohio together with some along the general border.⁹ Generally, the "fringe areas" included in the full region are more prosperous than those in the core tiers defined by the council. However, they are still considered to be economically distressed. Both of

these delineations are described because both have been used in recent writings concerned with Appalachia, and, in themselves, are important insofar as ecological ramifications are apparent in Appalachia's culture today. In this paper, we are referring to the larger region unless we specify otherwise.

There is general consensus in the writings about Appalachia that the terrain, 90 percent of which is mountain slopes cut through with streams and rivers in the bottom land,¹⁰ has helped nurture and preserve for almost 300 years cultural pockets where the inhabitants' way of life is somehow out-of-step with twentieth-century America and is possibly self-destructive.

Residents of Appalachia are not a homogeneous group, nor has the area existed unchanged and in total isolation since the seventeenth century. On the contrary, the Appalachian mountain area was settled by pioneers typical to any newly developing area of America at that time. According to D. H. Davis, the originating stock of the mountain regions was, in all probability, the same as that of other areas but it has been modified by long isolation in an area of lesser opportunity.¹¹

Loyal Jones, in his analysis of the impact of Appalachian culture on aspiration, writes:

. . .there is no doubt that the isolation and the primitive life of the frontier changed the people. Scattered as they were, they could not provide the communal school nor have the accoutrements of a literate society. They relied on oral communication. They told tales and sang ballads and folk songs handed down from generation to generation. They became interested only in the basic necessities of survival. Their religion was shaped to fit the life they had to live.¹²

The values to which the mountaineer clings tend to be those which inhibit changes in his life-styles. Thomas R. Ford, a continuing student of Appalachia, points to four characteristics, common to most early pioneers, which have been preserved in Appalachian culture and which tend to limit absorption into the larger culture: *individualism and self-reliance*, which he says are viewed by the mountaineer not as a prerogative but a duty; *traditionalism*, a tendency to look more toward the past than to the future; *familism*, a reluctance to interreact with or settle near other than his own kin; and *fundamentalism and fatalism*, an emphasis on the rewards of the "next world" (possibly because the rewards of this world were usually unattainable from the terrain) and an acceptance of whatever came to pass as "the Lord's will."¹³

In his book on Appalachia, Jack E. Weller writes that

Thousands of persons in the mountains still live a life of isolation. These are the families farthest up the hollows, where the creek bed may often serve as the road, in the coves that extend for miles up the twisting valleys, and out on the tops of the mountain ridges. These folk have but occasional contact even with their neighbors, who may well be their own kin. They may not take even a weekly newspaper.¹⁴

According to Weller, these people are unlikely to join groups; are almost passive in accepting the status quo, "for things are all right as they are and change seems always for the worse"; and have few broadening experiences open to them, even such simple things as sitting with people they do not know on a bus or shopping in a supermarket.¹⁵

While there is some indication that these traditional views are receding,¹⁶ the region, particularly that part of it known as the Appalachian South, possesses many of the characteristics of underdeveloped areas of the world. On almost any available indicator of modernity, this region does not show up well. James Branscome¹⁷ reports that 65 percent of the region's students still do not graduate from high school. The bulk of the students drop out between the seventh and ninth grades. Of the rural dropouts, less than 30 percent of farm students and only about 40 percent of non-farm students complete ten grades of school. In some counties in the region the dropout rate has reached 71 percent, which is double the national rate, and only one of ten Appalachian students goes on to college. The region does not always gain when one of its young people does complete a college education. Demographic studies indicate that those trained in the region's colleges migrate in significant numbers to other areas. For example, 85 percent of the teachers in Hamilton County, Ohio and in Cincinnati, Ohio school systems are Appalachian immigrants. Nearly 70 percent of the young teachers returning to or remaining in the region leave after their first four years. The result is a loss of talent which can scarcely be spared.

One reason for this loss, of course, is the difference in financial support of schools. The average local government expenditure on education per pupil in the United States in 1960 was \$286 a year. For Southern Appalachia the same expenditure per pupil was only \$196, or nearly one-third less. Even in metropolitan areas in the region, local government expenditures averaged only \$204, and non-metropolitan areas dropped to \$193. On a county-by-county basis, only sixteen counties in the region had averages which were higher than the national average. The lowest average for a single county was \$49, the figure for Alexander County, North Carolina.¹⁸ These conditions existed even though more than 55 percent of all local government expenditures in Appalachia were spent on education. For the nation, only 43.8 percent of local government revenues were spent on education.

Branscome further reports that standardized IQ tests have shown that the IQs of school children of the area have been declining gradually from $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ point annually for thirteen years.

Over the years, there has been a general trend toward urbanization in the United States. The 1960 census figures show approximately 30 percent of the nation's population living in rural areas. Appalachia, however, is about 50 percent rural, and in Southern Appalachia 5.4 million people—or 62 percent of the entire Southern Appalachian population—lived under rural conditions in 1960.

While the population of the United States increased by 19.1 percent from 1950 to 1960, the total population of Southern Appalachia remained fairly constant or tended to decrease in specific counties. Net losses for individual counties ranged as high as 47.6 percent of the 1950 population. Both a declining birth rate and migration account for

the decrease in population. In addition, the population has shown a structural change. The percentage of persons under 21 plus those over 65 (the dependency ratio) is greater in Appalachia than in the general United States. The description prepared by the Council of the Southern Mountains draws the conclusion that out-migration has occurred primarily among persons of child-bearing and working age; that is, those over 21 and under 65 years of age.

Over 30 percent of the families in Appalachia and nearly 40 percent of those in Southern Appalachia¹⁹ had incomes in 1960 of less than \$3,000, compared with the national average of 21.4 percent.²⁰

According to Ford, there are great variations among communities and class groups. The majority of Appalachian residents will rank among comparable groups in the nation, but there remains a core problem group which can be recognized throughout a long period of regional history.

INPUTS FOR CHANGE

The first major efforts at change through intervention programs came during the New Deal after its agencies had publicized the pressure of population on limited regional resources. In the main, changes were introduced into the region through public works programs, state support of local education, and highway programs financed by the Federal and state governments. In each case, according to Ford, the helping institution neither asked nor required that the region's residents determine and then help solve their community's problems. Evaluating the effect of this kind of support, Rupert B. Vance observed:

The present paradox of the mountains is thus very real. The rugged individualists, who hope to run their own affairs, now expect and receive more outside relief and subsidy from government, churches, and private agencies in proportion to their own contributions than any area of comparable size in the nation.²¹

Calls for a program which would focus on the people, as opposed to those limited to economic development of a region, and which would encourage problem-solving by groups rather than by individuals, have been heard frequently in Appalachia.²² A program of dynamic planned intervention intended to meet these needs is the Community Action Program of the Office of Economic Opportunity. This program included the introduction of new ideas and practices which might bring about changes in the attitudes and behaviors of the people toward such objects as health practices, child-rearing practices, educational aspirations for children, enrichment of children's cultural backgrounds, purchasing and other consumer activities, occupational aspirations, and training in practices which could supplement their income. It also included a "maximum feasible participation" requirement which was intended to involve the poor people themselves in decision-making—something they had seldom

done in the community development councils which were scattered throughout Appalachia.²³

Other inputs into Appalachia which in whole or in part might be called "educational"—in addition to the formal education systems themselves (which will be discussed later)—include a wide variety of new programs developed since passage of four major pieces of national legislation. These legislative packages were the Economic Opportunity Act (under which the program mentioned above was established), the Appalachian Development Act, the Area Development Act, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In addition, there are several programs which have been operating for many years, such as regional development programs and those conducted by agricultural extension agents.²⁴

Little, at this time, has been done to assess the contributions of the mass media toward modernizing the Appalachian region. Rogers has found that the mass media are *intervening* variables in the modernization process in Colombia,²⁵ and John T. McNelly noted that

Much of the content in all the media, including advertising, is informational, educational, or propagandistic in nature, designed to inform or persuade people about various kinds of modernization.²⁶

The media, in most cases, might be classed as "accidental" inputs for change as opposed to "planned" inputs for change—accidental in that they present information about the life-styles of the larger culture but the information has not been prepared specifically to provoke a change in the Appalachian resident, anymore than it has been prepared to change the behaviors of other people.

It appears likely, however, that Appalachia is not served well by the mass media. Cyrus Johnson, author of *Mountain Families in Poverty*, writes that

Contrasted with the larger American society, mass media reaches these people in an extremely limited way.²⁷

Much of the region is not within the prime reception area of a single television station and reception is quite often poor. The rural areas are served by small, weekly newspapers; few inhabitants subscribe to large, metropolitan dailies which tend to contain more developmental information than the small weeklies.²⁸

On the other hand, the residents of the region have not been isolated totally from the mass media, particularly television. John Photiadis reports that exposure to television has made the rural resident of the region increasingly aware of the life-style and value orientation of the larger society, causing disruptive expectations. Little, if anything, however is offered by the individual's community which will help him achieve these expectations. The Appalachian has the choice of remaining in the region, dissatisfied and frustrated, or migrating to an area where he feels he may acquire the societal goods displayed on the television screen.²⁹

EFFORTS AT CHANGING LIFE-STYLES OF INDIVIDUALS

In our introduction, we referred to two kinds of approaches to change which might be called "educational." One of these involves the diffusion of information³⁰ throughout a social system. This may come in many ways, not the least of which is through the formal educational system. Schwarzweller and Brown studied the functions of education in rural social change, particularly in rural-urban sociocultural integration, using Appalachian data and insight from research in the eastern mountain (Appalachian) region of Kentucky. Their central conclusion was that education functions as a major cultural bridge between the greater society and relatively isolated, familistically-oriented subculture. They report that education, as a "thing to get," is sanctioned by the mores and folkways of the rural society. They also add that teachers are trained in colleges that emphasize more urban norms and return as "insiders" to their home regions to teach others. By teaching the normative pattern of the greater society, they inculcate the youngster with its culture and allow him, in turn, to become an agent of change in the rural community or to make an easier adjustment to urban life if he migrates.³¹

These conclusions are supported in part by H. Dudley Plunkett. Using data gathered from several Appalachian counties, he stated that school teachers are the chief and sometimes the only persons with any exposure to the outside, although many of them are almost as totally local in experience and perception as their neighbors. He said the more mature teachers in the isolated areas see themselves and are seen by others not only as carriers of knowledge and ideas to school youth, but also as the chief sources of information and interpreters of it among the local adults.

The Appalachian Regional Commission (1968) recommends that better teacher preparation and a restructuring of educational systems are priority actions. The commission reports that the rural school and rural school teacher are close to the people:

Often the teacher is a native of the area with many close, personal relationships. She knows the pupils outside of the school setting and can adjust instruction to individual differences.

The small size enables the rural school to be much more flexible in scheduling classes and for varying the school routine to adjust to special situations. Few rural schools, however, take advantage of these positive factors for a variety of reasons.³²

Schwarzweller and Brown attributed a much smaller impact to the system of governmental agencies maintained and sponsored by the greater society within the local community, such as acreage control programs, the Agricultural Extension Service, Soil Conservation Service, various regulatory agencies, Social Security, and taxation. Most of these agencies have limited and specific educative functions and are generally staffed by "outsiders." With the coming of large-scale intervention programs, the effectiveness of outsiders has changed somewhat.

In a large before-after study of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), Lewis Donohew and B. Krishna Singh gathered data on 57 indicators of the life-styles of rural Appalachian subjects. It was found that subjects in communities served by OEO programs showed substantial changes in the direction of "modernity," while those in communities not served either remained about the same or even became "less modern." The greatest differences were shown on adoption of innovations and ranged through changes in level of media exposure and in psychosocial attitudes and behaviors, to the least changes in the "base for modernity"—income, education, etc., although even here there were some changes in the two-year period of the study. Differences in extent of modernization between areas served by the OEO and those not served remained after a Q-technique factor analysis procedure was used to divide subjects into "types" of persons who most resembled one another in their life-styles, ranging along a continuum from least modern to most modern. One of the three types found was an "isolated" type,³³ which was considered the prime target of the program. Persons of this type tended to be the most receptive of all to innovations promoted by the program.

Plunkett found that the more isolated school teachers were also among those who were the most receptive to change. In this study, teachers most removed from the bureaucracy of education were the most receptive to innovations. Their degree of sensitivity to certain needs was found to *increase* with social isolation within the mountains.

Several studies, both in Appalachia and in underdeveloped countries around the world, have supported this curious finding—that those within the hard-core poverty group appear to be the most susceptible to change, at least to the extent of adopting new ideas within the definition of information presented above.

Donohew and Singh, also using Appalachian subjects, found the level of adoption of new ideas introduced by the OEO to be inversely related to their level of exposure to the outside world.

Somewhat similar findings have been reported from other underdeveloped areas by Nan Lin and by Marion R. Brown.³⁴

All of this indicates that one of the prime target groups for educational change—the hard-core poor—is reachable and changeable through educational programs, at least to the extent of having its members adopt new ideas and practices which are aimed specifically at them.

Herbert Hirsch, who studied political socialization of youth in the OEO program, found that youth did not participate strongly in the program but that those who did broadened their range of activities and expectations. He warned that if these changed expectations were not matched with the possibility of fulfillment, the program might produce frustration in the end.³⁵

EFFORTS AT CHANGING THE INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE

The foregoing raises the question of what happens next. Following diffusion of new ideas into the system, will a "revolution of rising expectations" carry the society

forward and lead to eventual change in the institutional structures as well? Will an aroused citizenry demand better schooling and a greater voice in its operation, for example? And if so, will its increased expectations in this and other things be met?

The data we have evaluated are too limited and the time period involved is too short to reasonably expect major changes to have occurred.

The glum picture of the "educational establishment" presented at the beginning of this paper is given some empirical support by Plunkett. He reports that most high school principals and a few of the male teachers are very closely tied with local politics and the local establishment. He found that only a small fraction of teachers, however, are integrated into community activities outside the school. He also found attitudes indicating strong resistance to change in the local officeholders. He said public officials were disinclined to see anything wrong with local institutions and had reservations with respect to outsiders.³⁶ His report is consistent with the comments of Caudill and many others whose observations and insights are based upon long experience with the Appalachian people.

This is also consistent with the situation in many underdeveloped countries. According to Rogers,

In less developed nations power often lies in the hands of oligarchs who dominate the national economic and political life. These latter-day Junkers who often give public lip service to development goals have proved generally reluctant to endorse programs that alter or upset the *status quo*. Rapid change usually brings with it a new corps of "influentials." Thus, while espousing the gospel of a better life for all, a ruling elite hesitates to initiate actual major alterations in the social structure, which in turn could affect their positions of power.³⁷

In some cases, educational innovation has been barred at the state legislative level, or has been initiated with no provision made for implementation. The 1968 Appalachian Regional Commission Report suggests that a program of early childhood education (beginning at age 3 and continuing through third grade) would expose the Appalachian child to stimulation and exposure which would pattern his future development potential. They report, however, that—with the exception largely of "Head Start" classes funded by the OEO—as of 1967 less than 15 percent of the estimated 600,000 Appalachian four- and five-year-olds had an early education available to them for a significant period. The commission has reported that all the Appalachian states except Alabama have legislation permitting kindergarten programs in local schools, but that only five of these, largely in the northern states of Appalachia, have supported such programs. A number of demonstration efforts have been established in Tennessee, yet no legislation for a state-wide program has been passed and in three other states—Georgia, North Carolina, and West Virginia—the necessary legislation was introduced but defeated. In two other states the legislation passed, but there are insufficient resources to establish the programs in each district.³⁸

One of the things found by Plunkett in his multi-county study was that those persons in the best position to change the schools were also the ones who expressed the greatest satisfaction with schools as they were. This contrasts with recommendations by others for study and possible change. The Educational Advisory Committee to the Appalachian Regional Commission has stated, for example, that differences between the family, culture, social setting, and mores of the urban and the Appalachian youth are "demonstrable and significant," but the educational effects of these differences have not been studied.³⁹ We can only say that the character of the "deprived" Appalachian probably demands a different system and a different approach to education.⁴⁰

With new stirrings for change in some areas following introduction of new programs, what are chances for changes in leadership? We have found only one study which focuses on the leadership structure of an area in relation to a program involving planned social change, and the evidence is slight. Willis A. Sutton, Jr., who studied perceived changes in leadership and participation in neighborhood activities in an Appalachian county (Knox County, Kentucky), wrote that respondents in areas served by OEO Community Action Program community centers named more leaders per respondent in 1968 than they had when first measured in 1966. He reported there was also greater consensus in 1968 on who the leaders were.⁴¹ He said that those in center areas also reported more neighborhood activities and showed enlarged perspectives on the realities of the decision process and attributed the change to the impact of the program. Although basic county leadership was not changed, more people from relatively low income groups as well as more poor people themselves became active, presumably as a consequence of the "maximum feasible participation" principle effected through the program.⁴²

DISCUSSION

Even if one accepts the evidence reported in the section on changing the life-styles of individuals through diffusion of information about "what the better things of life might be," prospects for changes in the institutional structure to accommodate changes in individual aspirations and needs would appear to be slight. Residents of the area accepting new ideas and developing new drives appear to be in the position of getting all dressed up with no place to go—except to leave the region. Given this situation, one might argue that increased expectations on the part of the Appalachian people could not be accompanied by increased accomplishments and therefore would contribute only to heightened frustrations. Thus, the argument might be that the introduction of new ideas into such a system could, in fact, be dysfunctional.

However, we should not be so hasty to arrive at a pessimistic conclusion. The evidence is fairly clear that those persons who need it most can be reached with new ideas, and there is even some indication that in a large-scale intervention program in which there is participation by the ordinary citizen there are the beginnings of change in the leadership structure. Continued inputs and more time may produce more dramatic

results. The dollar cost of the intervention programs may be only a fraction of the dollar cost of continuing the status quo, to say nothing of the social costs. Paul Street has noted that in one area, for example, the annual welfare cost is \$2,837,000, while a large-scale OEO program for the same territory is operated on a budget of approximately one-third that amount.⁴³

It is the conviction of the authors that only through large-scale intervention programs, conducted by "outside" experts, will it be possible for the Appalachian population to overcome the obstacles which keep it bound to the past more than to the present or future. If changes generated in individuals are to be nurtured, it is imperative that change occur in the institutional structures as well. This may come only after education of the "common man" to participate in the decision-making process, controversial as that might be. It could be fostered (as has been attempted by the OEO) by having him take part in analyzing the needs and developing the change programs for his community. We agree with John Friedman that

Programs such as these will not be easy to conceive and carry out. They will require a much better understanding of the spatial structure of the region and of the social and cultural patterns of the communities within it. Programs focused on people rather than objects need to be subtle, diversified, non-bureaucratic, and responsive to their values; they must be conducted by very expert hands, yet, for all the problems they present, they are critical components of a development strategy for a poor region in a rich country.⁴⁴

NOTES

1. Rogers, Everett M., and Lynne Svenning: *Modernization Among Peasants: The Impact of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1969, p. 43. This is the most comprehensive work available for the study of communication and development.
2. Lerner, Daniel: "Toward a Communication Theory of Modernization: A Set of Considerations." In Pye, Lucian W. (Ed.): *Communications and Political Development*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963, pp. 341-342.
3. Schrag, Peter: "The School and Politics." *Appalachian Review*, 1 (2): 6-10, Fall 1966.
4. Schwarzweller, Harry K., and James S. Brown: "Education as a Cultural Bridge Between Eastern Kentucky and the Great Society." *Rural Sociology*, 27: 357-373, 1962.
5. Grunig, James E.: "Communication and the Economic Decision Making Processes of Colombian Peasants." Paper presented to the International Communication Division, Association for Education in Journalism, Berkeley, California, August 1969.
6. Ford, Thomas R.: "The Passing of Provincialism." In Ford, Thomas R. (Ed.): *The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1962, pp. 9-35; Plunkett, Harold D.: "The Elementary School-teacher as an Interstitial Person: An Essay in Human Ecology and the Sociology of Communication." Ph.D. Dissertation. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1967; Bowinan, Mary Jean, and H. D. Plunkett: *Communication and Mountain Development: A Summary Report of Two East Kentucky Studies*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration, May 1969; Donohew, Lewis, and B. Krishna Singh: *Community Action in Appalachia: Modernization of Life Styles*. Final Report. Washington, D. C.: Office of Economic Opportunity, August 1968; Schwarzweller and Brown (n. 4): *Rural Sociology*, 27: 357-373.
7. Schrag (n. 3): *Appalachian Review*, 1 (2): 7.
8. Rogers, Everett M., and Lynne Svenning: *Change in Small Schools*. Las Cruces: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools, New Mexico State University, May 1969; Rogers, Everett M.: *Diffusion of Innovations*. New York: Free Press, 1962; Rogers and Svenning (n. 1): *Modernization Among Peasants: The Impact of Communication*.
9. "Southern Appalachia, A Statistical Description of a Depressed Area" (unpublished). Prepared by the Council of the Southern Mountains, Berea, Kentucky, January 1966.
10. Ford (n. 6): *The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey*; Weller, Jack E.: *Yesterday's People; Life in Contemporary Appalachia*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, with collaboration of the Council of the Southern Mountains, 1964; Caudill, Harry M.: *Night Comes to the Cumberlands, A Biography of a Depressed Area*. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co., 1962.
11. Davis, D. H.: *Geography of the Kentucky Mountains*. Frankfort, Kentucky, 1928, pp. 157-158.
12. Jones, Loyal: From a revision of a paper read at an institute on Expanding Opportunities for Educationally Disadvantaged Students in Graduate Schools of Social Work, Washington, D. C., June 15-24, 1967, p. 3.
13. Ford (n. 6): *The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey*, pp. 9-85.

14. Weller (n. 10): *Yesterday's People; Life in Contemporary Appalachia*, p. 88.
15. Ibid., pp. 88-89. Opportunity for these broadening experiences is involved in the concept of "cosmopolitaness," which is found as a consistent predictor of change. Rogers (n. 1): *Modernization Among Peasants: The Impact of Communication*.
16. Vance, Rupert B.: "The Region: A New Survey." In Ford, T. R. (Ed.): *The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1962, p. 5.
17. Branscome, James: "The Crisis of Appalachian Youth." *Appalachia*, 2 (8): 16, May 1969.
18. "Southern Appalachia, A Statistical Description of a Depressed Area" (n. 9), p. 5.
19. Ibid., p. 4.
20. *Appalachian Region Data Book*. Prepared for the President's Appalachian Regional Commission. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, Center for Regional Economic Studies, July 1964, p. 14.
21. Vance (n. 16): In Ford, T. R. (Ed.): *The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey*, p. 5.
22. See, for example, Friedman, John: "Poor Regions and Poor Nations." *Appalachia*, 1 (8): 17, April 1968; Bird, Alan R.: "Discussion: Appalachia: Problems and Solutions." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Southern Agricultural Workers, Dallas, Texas, February 1, 1965.
23. Street, Paul: "Community Action Versus Appalachian Poverty." Forthcoming in *Appalachia*.
24. Describing some of these new programs, Jones wrote: "There are many hopeful signs that things are changing. Better schools, the Economic Opportunity Act, the Appalachian Development Act and efforts of various private agencies are bringing some hopeful programs to the region. They have also brought in new persons with new ideas. The Community Action Programs with their involvement of the poor have caused many persons to lay aside their apathy and modesty and get involved in development programs. Upward Bound and similar programs have involved young people in enrichment experiences and have shown them that it is possible to go to college and to become whatever they wish to be. The Appalachian Volunteers, VISTA and other organizations have involved mountain young people in programs which have raised their horizons." (Jones [n. 12]: Revision of a paper read at an institute on Expanding Opportunities for Educationally Disadvantaged Students in Graduate Schools of Social Work.)
25. Rogers, Everett M.: "Mass Media Exposure and Modernization Among Colombian Peasants." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 29: 614-625, Winter 1965-1966.
26. McNelly, John T.: "Mass Communication and the Climate for Modernization in Latin America." Paper presented before the Association for Education in Journalism, Austin, Texas, 1964.
27. Johnson, Cyrus M., et al.: *Mountain Families in Poverty, Final Report*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1967, p. 78.
28. See, for example, Donohew, Lewis, and Robert K. Thorp: "An Approach to the Study of Mass Communication Within a State." *Journalism Quarterly*, 43: 264-268, Summer 1966. In an Office of Economic Opportunity study, Donohew found that about one-third of the respondents were exposed to some kind of newspaper, about half to television, and almost nine out of ten to radio. In attempting to assess the relationship of different kinds of mass media content to modernization, he found that respondents who were exposed to public

affairs programs or content were significantly higher on indicators of receptiveness to change than those who were exposed only to other kinds of programs or content. Those not exposed to these kinds of programs or content but watching or listening to something were more receptive to modernization than those with no media exposure. No attempt was made to establish a causal relationship, however. (Donohew, Lewis: "Communication and Readiness for Change in Appalachia." *Journalism Quarterly*, 44: 679-687, Winter 1967.)

29. Photiadis, John: *Change in the Rural Southern Appalachian Community, Research Series 7*. Morgantown: West Virginia University, Center for Appalachian Studies and Development, 1968, pp. 1-11.
30. McDonough breaks this concept into three components: (1) data, or unevaluated messages; (2) information, or data evaluated to apply in a specific problem situation; and (3) knowledge, or data evaluated for future use in general. The diffusion of innovations seems to fall most clearly under component 2 above, although undoubtedly some of it is included in components 1 and 3. (McDonough, Adrian M.: *Information Economics and Management Systems*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963, p. 76.) A brief critique of the diffusion of innovations approach is contained in Grunig (n. 5): "Communication and the Economic Decision Making Processes Among Colombian Peasants." Grunig supports the second position, that institutions must be attacked first, and offers empirical support for his position.
31. Schwarzweller and Brown (n. 4): *Rural Sociology*, 27: 373, 1962.
32. *Appalachian Regional Commission Annual Report*. Washington, D. C.: Appalachian Regional Commission, 1968, p. 52.
33. The other two are an "outgoing type" and a "mass media type," the latter being the most modern. (Donohew, Lewis, and B. Krishna Singh: "Poverty 'Types' and Their Sources of Information About New Practices." A paper presented before the International Communication Division, Association for Education in Journalism, Boulder, Colorado, 1967.) See also by the same authors, "Communication and Life Styles in Appalachia." *Journal of Communication*, 19 (3): 202-216, September 1969.
34. See Nan Lin's "Information Flow, Influence Flow, and the Decision-Making Process: Testing a New Conceptualization of the Communication Flow in a Developing Country" and Marion R. Brown's "Communication and Agricultural Development: A Field Experiment in Chile." Both papers were presented before the International Communication Division, Association for Education in Journalism, Berkeley, California, 1969.
35. Hirsch, Herbert: *Community Action in Appalachia: Poverty, Participation and Political Socialization*. Unit 5 Final Report. Washington, D. C.: Office of Economic Opportunity, August 1968.
36. In a paper analyzing the present-day education system in Appalachia, Margaret Anderson reports that studies indicate most mountain people are also satisfied with their schools and think the programs are adequate when, in fact, the majority of the youth have not been provided with the knowledge and training required for high-income employment. She concluded that "Until communities see a need for and demand better education for their children, there will be no far-reaching improvements." See Anderson, Margaret: "Education in Appalachia: Past Failures and Future Prospects." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, pp. 443-446, November 1964.
37. Rogers (n. 1): *Modernization Among Peasants: The Impact of Communication*, p. 13.

38. *Appalachian Regional Commission Annual Report* (n. 32), p. 54.
39. However, Schwarzweller has investigated the influence of education and migration on occupational placement and economic life-chances of rural Appalachian youth. Ten years after they had been enrolled in the eighth grade, he traced 300 males and found (1) that migrant "dropouts" exhibited a higher standard of living than non-migrant dropouts (about half of the migrants were employed in manufacturing; about half of the non-migrants were employed in mines or on farms) and (2) that there was very little difference in the level of living between high school graduates who migrated and those who remained. (See Schwarzweller, Harry K.: "Education, Migration, and Economic Life Chances of Male Entrants to the Labor Force from a Low-Income Rural Area." *Rural Sociology*, 29: 152-167, June 1964.) The possibility remains however, that there are differences between the economic life-chances of high school graduates from non-Appalachian schools and those from Appalachian schools.
40. Vocational education, viewed by many as a panacea for the education problems of the region, may be falling considerably short of that. According to Branscome, the first problem is that all too often secondary schools are out of touch with the realities of the labor market. Students are frequently trained for jobs which do not exist and are not trained to fill those jobs which are available. A much higher proportion of students are enrolled in agriculture and home economics than in trades and industry courses, but most job openings occur in the latter field. He noted the comment of the Appalachian Educational Advisory Committee that "No greater harm could be done to a youngster than to train him for a job soon to become obsolete."
41. Sutton, Willis A., Jr.: *Leadership and Community Relations*. Unit 8 Final Report. Washington, D. C.: Office of Economic Opportunity, August 1968.
42. A historical footnote which might be included here is that a school board election was held in Knox County, Kentucky, following about two years of exposure, on the average, to programs involving a "maximum feasible participation" approach to planned change. An effort was made by some of those involved in the program to elect school board members running against those supporting the incumbent school administration. The challengers were defeated.
43. Street (n. 23): "Community Action Versus Appalachian Poverty."
44. Friedman (n. 22): *Appalachia*, 1 (8): 17.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Margaret: "Education in Appalachia: Past Failures and Future Prospects." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, pp. 443-446, November 1964.
- Appalachian Region Data Book*. Prepared for the President's Appalachian Regional Commission. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, Center for Regional Economic Studies, July 1964.
- Appalachian Regional Commission Annual Report*. Washington, D. C.: Appalachian Regional Commission, 1968. 159 pp. (ERIC ED 029 734: MF-\$0.75, HC-\$8.05.)
- Bird, Alan R.: "Discussion: Appalachia: Problems and Solutions." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Southern Agricultural Workers, Dallas, Texas, February 1, 1965.
- Bowman, Mary Jean, and H. Dudley Plunkett: *Communication and Mountain Development: A Summary Report of Two East Kentucky Studies*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration, May 1969.
- Branscome, James: "The Crisis of Appalachian Youth." *Appalachia*, 2 (8): 16-21, May 1969.
- Brown, Marion R.: "Communication and Agricultural Development: A Field Experiment in Chile." Paper presented before the International Communication Division, Association for Education in Journalism, Berkeley, California, 1969.
- Caudill, Harry M.: *Night Comes to the Cumberlands, A Biography of a Depressed Area*. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co., 1962. 409 pp. (ERIC ED 030 527: Not available from EDRS.)
- Davis, D. H.: *Geography of the Kentucky Mountains*. Frankfort, Kentucky, 1928.
- Donohew, Lewis: "Communication and Readiness for Change in Appalachia." *Journalism Quarterly*, 44: 679-687, Winter 1967.
- Donohew, Lewis, and B. Krishna Singh: "Communication and Life Styles in Appalachia." *Journal of Communication*, 19 (3): 202-216, September 1969.
- Donohew, Lewis, and B. Krishna Singh: *Community Action in Appalachia: Modernization of Life Styles*. Final Report. Washington, D. C.: Office of Economic Opportunity (Contract No. 693), August 1968.
- Donohew, Lewis, and B. Krishna Singh: "Poverty 'Types' and Their Sources of Information About New Practices." Paper presented before International Communication Division, Association for Education in Journalism, Boulder, Colorado 1967.
- Donohew, Lewis, and Robert K. Thorp: "An Approach to the Study of Mass Communication Within a State." *Journalism Quarterly*, 43: 264-268, Summer 1966.
- Ford, Thomas R.: "The Passing of Provincialism." In Ford, Thomas R. (Ed.): *The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1962. 32 pp. (ERIC ED 027 133: Not available from EDRS.)

*Entries followed by an ED number in parentheses are generally available in hard copy (HC) or microfiche (MF) through the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC). Order from ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), The National Cash Register Company, 4936 Fairmont Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland 20014. For all orders, add \$0.50 handling charge plus sales tax appropriate to the state where the order is originated. Foreign orders must be accompanied by a 25 percent service charge, calculated to the nearest cent. Payment must accompany orders totaling less than \$5.00. Items with ED numbers only are available from the publisher.

- Friedman, John: "Poor Regions and Poor Nations." *Appalachia*, 1 (8): 17, April 1968.
- Grunig, James E.: "Communication and the Economic Decision Making Processes of Colombian Peasants." Paper presented to the International Communication Division, Association for Education in Journalism, Berkeley, California, August 1969.
- Hirsch, Herbert: *Community Action in Appalachia: Poverty, Participation and Political Socialization*. Unit 5 Final Report. Washington, D. C.: Office of Economic Opportunity (Contract No. 693), August 1968.
- Johnson, Cyrus M., et al.: *Mountain Families in Poverty, Final Report*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1967. 126 pp. (ERIC ED 027 115: MF-\$0.50, HC-\$6.40.)
- Jones, Loyal: Revision of a paper read at an institute on Expanding Opportunities for Educationally Disadvantaged Students in Graduate Schools of Social Work, Washington, D. C., June 15-24, 1967.
- Lerner, Daniel: "Toward a Communication Theory of Modernization: A Set of Considerations." In Pye, Lucian W. (Ed.): *Communications and Political Development*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.
- Lin, Nan: "Information Flow, Influence Flow, and the Decision-Making Process: Testing a New Conceptualization of the Communication Flow in a Developing Country." Paper presented before the International Communication Division, Association for Education in Journalism, Berkeley, California, 1969.
- McDonough, Adrian M.: *Information Economics and Management Systems*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.
- McNelly, John T.: "Mass Communication and the Climate for Modernization in Latin America." Paper presented before the Association for Education in Journalism, Austin, Texas, 1964.
- Photiadis, John: *Change in the Rural Southern Appalachian Community, Research Series 7*. Morgantown: West Virginia University, Center for Appalachian Studies and Development, 1968. 14 pp. (ERIC ED 026 187: MF-\$0.25, HC-\$0.80.)
- Plunkett, Harold Dudley: "The Elementary School-teacher as an Interstitial Person: An Essay in Human Ecology and the Sociology of Communication." Ph.D. Dissertation. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1967.
- Rogers, Everett M.: *Diffusion of Innovations*. New York: Free Press, 1962.
- Rogers, Everett M.: "Mass Media Exposure and Modernization Among Colombian Peasants." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 29: 614-625, Winter 1965-1966.
- Rogers, Everett M., and Lynne Svenning: *Change in Small Schools*. Las Cruces: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools, New Mexico State University, May 1969. 34 pp. (ERIC ED 029 749: MF-\$0.25, HC-\$1.80.)
- Rogers, Everett M., and Lynne Svenning: *Modernization Among Peasants: The Impact of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1969.
- Schrag, Peter: "The School and Politics." *Appalachian Review*, 1 (2): 6-10, Fall 1966.
- Schwarzweiler, Harry K.: "Education, Migration, and Economic Life Chances of Male Entrants to the Labor Force from a Low-Income Rural Area." *Rural Sociology*, 29: 152-167, June 1964.

Schwarzweiler, Harry K., and James S. Brown: "Education as a Cultural Bridge Between Kentucky and the Great Society." *Rural Sociology*, 27: 357-373, 1962.

"Southern Appalachia, A Statistical Description of a Depressed Area" (unpublished). Berea, Kentucky: Council of the Southern Mountains, January 1966.

Street, Paul: "Community Action Versus Appalachian Poverty." Forthcoming in *Appalachia*.

Sutton, Willis A., Jr.: *Leadership and Community Relations*. Unit 8 Final Report. Washington, D. C.: Office of Economic Opportunity (Contract No. 693), August 1968.

Vance, Rupert B.: "The Region: A New Survey." In Ford, Thomas R. (Ed.): *The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1962. 321 pp. (ERIC ED 027 133: Not available from EDRS.)

Weller, Jack E.: *Yesterday's People; Life in Contemporary Appalachia*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1964. 180 pp. (ERIC ED 027 125: Not available from EDRS.)